

REMARKS

Claims 5-7, 9, 11, 20, 34-36, 40, 45-47, 52-54 and 56-59, without prejudice, have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12-15, 17-19, 21-27, 30-33, 37-39, 41-44, 48-51, 55 and 60-62 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12-19, 21-33, 37-39, 41-44, 48-51, 55 and 60-62 are now pending.

Rejections under sec 112

In the subject office action, claims 1-2, 26 and 62 were rejected under sec 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-2, 26 and 62 have been amended to overcome the rejections. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejections under sec 102(e)

In the subject office action, claims 1, 3-6, 10, 16-18, 30, 32-35 and 45-47 were rejected under sec 102(e) as being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application 2002/0063799 by Oritz.

Rejections against claims 5-6, 34-35 and 45-47 have been rendered moot by their cancellations.

Claim 1 has been amended to clearly require "generating a first luminescent representation of a first of the one or more portions of a first of the one or more images ... without generating luminescent representations of the remaining portions of the image, to contribute to a cooperative generation of a multi-part luminescent representation of the first image with other wireless communication devices". Applicant submits the limitation is not taught by Oritz. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated, and patentable over Oritz.

Claim 30 has been similarly amended. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 30 is patentable over Oritz.

Claims 3-4, 10, 16-18 and 32-33 depend on either claim 1 or 30 incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-4, 10, 16-18 and 32-33 are patentable over Oritz.

Rejections under sec 103

In the subject office action, claims 8-9, 19, 25, 37-39 and 62 were rejected under sec 103, as being obvious in view of Oritz and in view of Rautiainen (EP 1109147 A1) and further in view of Yamamoto (US 6,466,183).

Rejection against claim 9 has been rendered moot by its cancellation.

Claims 19 and 62 have been similarly amended as claims 1 and 30. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 19 and 62 are patentable over Oritz. Neither Rautiainen nor Yamamoto remedy Oritz' deficiencies in teachings. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 1, 19, 30 and 62 are patentable over Oritz, even when combined with Rautiainen and Yamamoto.

Claims 8, 25 and 37-39 depend on either claim 1, 19 or 30, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 8, 25 and 37-39 are patentable over Oritz, even when combined with Rautiainen and Yamamoto.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 48-61 were allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing these claims. However, Applicant has nonetheless elected to cancel claims 52-54 and 56-59. Claims 48-51, 55, and 60-61 have been amended, but they remain allowable.

Claims 7, 11-15, 20-24, 36, 31, 40-44 are objected to for being dependent on rejected claims. Objections against claims 7, 11, 20, 36 and 40 have been rendered

moot by their cancellations. Claims 12-15, 21-24, 31 and 41-44 depend on either claim 1, 19 or 30, which are all in condition of allowance. Therefore, claims 12-15, 21-24, 31 and 41-44 are no longer dependent on rejected claims.

Claim 2, 26-29 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the sec 112, second paragraph rejections. Claims 2 and 26 have been amended accordingly.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12-19, 21-33, 37-39, 41-44, 48-51, 55 and 60-62 are now in condition of allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: December 16, 2004

By: 
Aloysius AuYeung
Reg# 35,432